

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application is requested in view of the remarks that follow.

In the October 26, 2004, Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Watanabe et al. reference. However, the Examiner stated that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims.

Original claim 3 depends directly from independent claim 1. As indicated above, original independent claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim original 3. Therefore, it is believed that currently amended claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

Original claim 3 has been cancelled.

Original claim 2 has been retained, reciting that the frequency/time domain based voltage signal recited in claim 1 comprises a pulsed signal.

New claim 4 has been added, reciting that the amplitude of the pulsed signal in claim 2 is about twice the amplitude of a supply voltage signal that is provided to the electrically erasable programmable read only memory cell.

It is believed that each of currently amended claim 1, original claim 2 and new claim 4 patentably distinguishes over the prior art and is in compliance with all requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Therefore, it is requested that this application be passed for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: March 25, 2005

By: 

Michael J. Pollock  
Reg. No. 29,098

Attorneys for Applicant(s)